



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,231	10/01/2001	Jean-Paul Menard	15675P360	2330

7590 12/19/2003

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman  
12400 Wilshire Blvd 7th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER
----------

WARREN, DAVID S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2837

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/869,231

Applicant(s)

MENARD, JEAN-PAUL

Examiner

David S. Warren

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The rejection of the previous office action (mailed May 8, 2003) stands. However, the examiner provides comments below wherein the instant application may be put in condition for allowance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 11 and 13 – 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey et al. ('729). Harvey discloses the elements of applicant's claims 1 and 18. The applicant argues (and has amended claim 1 to reflect that argument) that Harvey discloses a module for acquiring geophysical signals that includes a casing that is "individually linked to one track." The Harvey reference discloses that "[u]sually a sensor group will contain one to thirty geophones electrically interconnected to form a single data channel" (emphasis added). If Harvey were to use a single geophone, as is a suggested possibility, the Harvey reference will meet the applicant's claim 1. Regarding newly added independent claim 16, Harvey shows a plurality of tracks individually attached to a plurality of casings (as in the situation described above), the cable of Harvey has a connector to connect to a another module (cable 20 connects to other modules) and an adapter (40). The examiner appreciates the applicant's

assistance with understanding the difference between “connector” and “adapter.”

However, as defined by applicant (page 8 of the amendment received 2/20/03), in the case of Harvey, the connector also effects an electrical link as well as a mechanical link. The rejection of claims 2 – 5 are as stated in the previous office action.

Regarding claim 6, Harvey discloses an overvoltage limiter (col. 4, first paragraph). This is equivalent to applicants “spark arrester” – as the applicant admits on page 12, paragraph 4) of the specification. Regarding claim 7, the rigid member (14) of Harvey “carries” an electrical processing means (50). Regarding claim 8, gasket 16 provides leaktightness. Regarding claim 9, the gasket is a seal circumscribed by lugs (not shown – but holes therefore can be seen in figure 1). Regarding claim 10, the platen is considered to be the opposite face of housing 12. Regarding claim 11, the lugs will project toward the platen – see figure 1. Regarding claim 13, this is inherent in light of the arguments above, i.e., the sensor is outside the casing, so there must be a port to communicate within the casing. Regarding claims 14 and 15, as defined by the applicant, an adapter “effects an electrical link” – the casing of Harvey must inherently have two electrical connections (20, 40) – these appear to be “nonremovable” in the same sense as that that appears in applicant’s figures 4 and 6b.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey et al. in view of Richardson (3855566). The teachings of Harvey are discussed supra. Harvey does not disclose the use of a hermaphroditic connector. Richardson discloses the use of a hermaphroditic seal for seismic geophysical cables. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Harvey and Richardson to obtain a casing comprising a hermaphroditic seal or, in the case of claim 17, to provide a direct connection to a casing without the need for a connector. The motivation for making this combination is found in Richardson: "Identical connecting halves prevent having to swap the ends as is the case where the connecting halves are not identical."

### ***Response to Arguments***

The examiner concurs with the applicant regarding Harvey's multitrack architecture and the applicant's one casing per track. However, the examiner does not believe the current claims to explicitly define this limitation. The examiner suggests that the applicant explicitly claim "*at least one casing individually linked to one and only one track.*" The current claim language does not explicitly define the monotrack architecture. If the applicant were to adopt this explicit language in claims 1, 16, and 18, these claims would be allowable.

Regarding applicant's remarks pertaining to "two cable sections separated by at least one casing," the examiner does not agree. In the previous office action, the examiner referred to cable 20c as having two ends. The applicant countered that

argument by submitting that the cable sections require a casing between the cable sections. The examiner redefines two cable sections as the left section of cable 20d and the right section of cable 20c – with this interpretation, the two cable sections do have a casing (132d) therebetween.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Warren whose telephone number is 703-308-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30 A.M. to 6:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Nappi can be reached on 703-308-3370. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-9529.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

dsw

**ROBERT NAPPI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**